UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/558,449	10/05/2006	Peter Wanke	AP10704	6117	
Craig Hallacher	7590 10/16/200 •	EXAMINER			
Continental Tev	/es	ALGAHAIM, HELAL A			
One Continental Drive Auburn Hills, MI 48326			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				3663	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/16/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/558,449	WANKE ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	HELAL A. ALGAHAIM	3663			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 Not</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 12-22 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 12-22 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceed applicant may not request that any objection to the content of t	vn from consideration. relection requirement. r. epted or b) □ objected to by the B				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction		•			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	animer. Note the attached Office	ACION OF IONITE TO-102.			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/28/2005.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

Art Unit: 3663

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 12-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. In this case, the different process models are not explained in details in the specification. Examiner not clear on what these process models are. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 3. Claims **15-18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 4. Claims **15-18** recite "a control intervention". Examiner not clear when and how the control intervention are performed.
- 5. claim 15 recites "unlimited control". Applicant needs to be more specific.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 3663

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Amberkar (Pub. No.: US 2003/0042790 A1).

Regarding claim 12: Amberkar discloses a method for controlling a process comprising:

determining a control deviation by comparing a nominal value with an actual value of a control variable (see at least abstract and par. 0025).

determining a need for control based on the determined control deviation (see at least par. 0041).

determining an actual value of the control variable by way of a first process model (see at least par. 0033).

Art Unit: 3663

variable, wherein the control requirements are defined by way of additional process models and linked to each other by logical operations (see at least abstract, par. 0007par. 0035).

- 13. The method according to claim 12, wherein the additional process models are produced with various subsets of a multitude of measured variables (see at least par. 0031 and 0032).
- 14. The method according to claim 12, wherein a need for control (20) is found out only when there is a need for control (20, 30, 40) for the majority of the additional process models (see at least par. 0035).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amberkar
 (Pub. No.: US 2003/0042790 A1) in view of Brachert et al (Patent Number: 5790970).

Regarding claim 15-18: Amberkar does not explicitly disclose the limitations in claims 15-18. However, Brachert et al discloses them (see at least col. 2, lines 25-32; col. 8. lines 30-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

Art Unit: 3663

incorporate the teaching of Brachert et al in Amberkar for a better control of vehicle movement.

Regarding claims 19-21: Amberkar does not explicitly disclose the limitations in claims 15-18. However, Brachert et al discloses them (see at least fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Brachert et al in Amberkar for a better control of vehicle movement.

Regarding claims 22: Amberkar does not explicitly disclose the limitations in claims 15-18. However, Brachert et al discloses them (see at least col. 3, lines 14-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Brachert et al in Amberkar for a better control of vehicle movement.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HELAL A. ALGAHAIM whose telephone number is (571)270-5227. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:30 AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack W. Keith can be reached on 571-272-6878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3663

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H. A. A./ Examiner, Art Unit 3663

/Jack W. Keith/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3663